REMARKS

Claims 13-40, as amended, remain herein.

This Amendment places all claims 13-40 in condition for allowance, and surely in better condition for any appeal. Thus, entry of this Amendment and allowance of all claims 13-40 are respectfully requested.

The preamble of claims 33, 35, 36 and 39 has been amended to recite "first appliance," consistent with the last line of the claims. Claims 13, 25 and 30-34 have been amended to replace the word "therefore" with "of the second appliance" and claims 35, 36 and 39 have been amended to replace the word "therefore" with "of another appliance".

1. Claims 13, 14, 22-23, 25-27 and 31-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Welmer U.S. Patent 5,499,018.

The presently claimed appliance in a home bus system for controlling a plurality of appliances and method for controlling such appliance comprises controlling a linked operation for controlling an efficient operation of a second appliance in accordance with condition information of a first appliance.

This arrangement and corresponding method are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Welmer '018 as allegedly disclosing a PLAY command without further user intervention in response to the tape being fully rewound. However, in the presently claimed method and apparatus from controlling an appliance, the second appliance is linkedly operated based on the status of the first appliance. Welmer '018 does not disclose controlling a linked operation for controlling an operation of a second appliance in accordance with condition information of a first appliance, as recited in applicants' claims 13, 25, 30-36 and 39. Also, Welmer '018 does not disclose control signals being transmitted from one appliance directly to another appliance for linked operation of the other appliance, as recited in applicants' claims 13, 25, 30-36 and 39.

For the foregoing reasons, Welmer '018 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under \$102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Welmer '018 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively

anticipate or applicants' presently claimed suggest invention. Claims 14, 22 and 23 which depend from claim 13, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 13. Claims 26 27, which depend from claim 25, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 25. Claims 25, 31-36 and 39 are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 13, and claims 37 and 38, which depend from claim 36, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 36. Claim 40, which depends from claim 39, is allowable for the same described herein for claim39. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection respectfully requested.

2. Claims 14-21, 24, 28, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Welmer '018 and Beyers U.S. Patent 4,808,992.

The Office Action cites Beyers '018 as allegedly teaching an audio/visual system wherein a stop message status from any recording component will trigger a power off command to each recording component and signal source. However, Beyers '992 discloses controller 60 for receiving status signals from each

component and based on such signals, issuing a command to all appliances to power off. Thus, Beyers '992 does <u>not</u> overcome the deficiencies of Welmer '018 explained herein because Beyers '992 does <u>not</u> teach control signals being transmitted from one appliance directly to another appliance, and does <u>not</u> teach controlling a linked operation for controlling an operation of a second appliance in accordance with condition information of a first appliance.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Welmer '018 nor Beyers '992 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 15-21 and 24, which depend from claim 14, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 14. Claims 28 and 29, which depend from claim 25, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 25.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 14-21, 24, 28, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Welmer '018 alone or Beyers '992 and Burgmann U.S. Patent 4,801, 924.

The Office Action cites Burgmann '924 as allegedly teaching a programmable status transmitter for transmitting a status at change or at a programmed interval. But, neither Burgmann '924 nor Beyers '992 overcomes the deficiencies of Welmer '018 explained herein because neither Burgmann '924 nor Beyers '992 teaches control signals being transmitted from one appliance directly to another appliance, or controlling a linked operation for controlling an operation of a second appliance in accordance with condition information of a first appliance.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Welmer '018 nor Burgmann '924 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that

would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 15-21 and 24, which depend from claim 14, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 14. Claims 28 and 29, which depend from claim 25, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 25. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 13-40 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 13-40 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

Date

Roger W. Parkhurst

Registration No. 25,177

Robert N. Wieland

Registration No. 40,225

RWP/RNW/ch

Attorney Docket No.: OGOH:069

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

1421 Prince Street, Suite 210

Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805

Telephone: (703) 739-0220

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT OR CREDIT FEES TO DEP. ACCT. 16-0331 PARKHURST & WENDEL